

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/776,508	CURRY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan K. Tyler	2609	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nathan K. Tyler (Examiner).

(3) Jon Backenstose (REG. 47399).

(2) Brian P. Werner (SPE/Trainer).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 April 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 9, 14, 18, and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Roetting.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**BRIAN WERNER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Agreement was reached for overcoming claim objections. Examiner suggested amending claim 20 to recite "a tangible computer readable medium" to overcome the 101 rejections and to exclude the disclosed carrier wave reference. Applicants suggested that Roetling fails to disclose selecting the filter based on an estimate screen frequency and limit parameters. Examiner explained that due to the open-ended nature of e.g. claim 1, Roetling anticipates selection of a filter "based on" an estimated frequency and limit parameters (i.e. spatial gradients). No agreement was reached regarding allowable claim language.